

Remarks

Objections

Claims 1-15 were objected to because of a term contained in claims 1 and 9. In the interest of securing a rapid allowance, the term that was objected to has been deleted from the claims.

Rejections

In light of the claimed amendments, the present rejections are believed to be moot. In the present Office action claims 1, 4, 7-8 were found to be anticipated by Twigg et al. (US 5,647,756). A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found in a single cited art reference. See *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. See *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The pending claims have been amended to specify that the cam lever arms each have a ratchet head including teeth on the external circumference of each ratchet head and an arc groove on each ratchet head. A bearing assembly is disposed within the arc groove. The applicant notes Twigg et al. does not teach any of these now claimed elements. As shown in Figure 2, the arms 62 do not have ratchet heads, or external teeth, or any means for engaging these teeth, or an arc groove. Given that these elements are missing, the reference does not anticipate the applicant's claims.

In a similar manner, claims 1, 3 and 5-6 were found to be anticipated by Steketee (US 5,831,160). Again, in light of the amendments this claim should be withdrawn for the newly added claim elements are simply not found in the cited reference. In Steketee the first and second arms do not have ratchet heads, or external teeth, or any means for engaging

these teeth, or an arc groove. In both of the cited references, it is arguable that the disclosed arms even would be considered a "cam lever" as claimed by the applicant. However in light of the amendments, this issue is moot. The law requires that a reference teach every claimed element for the claim to be anticipated. In the present instance, every element is not found in the cited reference. The claim should thus be found allowable.

Finally, claims 2, 9 and 14-15 were held obvious by Twigg et al. (US 5,647,756) in view of Yoshizaki (US 4,717,346). As noted above, the claims have been amended such that Twigg et al. neither teach nor suggest a number of the limitations of the independent claims 1 and 9. Given that the elements of these independent claims are not disclosed in the cited references, the dependent claims should also be found to be allowable. Yoshizaki does not teach any of the elements lacking in Twigg et al. In fact, Yoshizaki lacks any arms or cam levers or similar devices entirely. Given that these elements are not disclosed in either of the cited references, they fail both alone and in combination to teach or suggest the elements claimed by the applicant.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicant believes the present claims are in condition for allowance. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited. If the examiner has any questions about this matter, please call the undersigned attorney at (408) 297-9733 between 9 AM and 5 PM Pacific time.

Respectfully submitted,

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Signed: Merle P. Garcia  
Typed Name: Merle P. Garcia

Date: April 13, 2006



David Schneck

Reg. No. 43,094

Schneck & Schneck

P.O. Box 2-E

San Jose, CA 95109-0005

(408) 297-9733